

VIEWSON THE WAR EXPRESSED BY "SUN" READERS

DISCUSSIONS SHARPER AS TO MERITS OF THE BELLIGERENTS

Letters From American in Germany Tell of His Anxiety—Militarism Forced on Germany—Hard to Excuse Invasion of Belgium.

THE SUN gives herewith the views of more of its readers on the war situation in Europe, without, of course, assuming any responsibility for the opinions expressed or statements made.

LETTERS OF AMERICAN LIVING IN GERMANY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The following letters have just arrived from Germany. They are from an American citizen, born in America and the son of a native American. These letters show how Americans living in Germany feel about the war.

New York, September 10.

Shortly after coming home this awful war business began, and now we are in the midst of the most anxious time we ever experienced. It certainly looks this time as if Germany would have to fight for her very existence, both against Austria and France, and it is not clear that she does not count for much, being occupied with Serbia besides. At the same time the German people are full of confidence and most patriotic. They are all around sides have already proved. But war means awful things for us all.

We are looking forward to real privations and will have to rely on our little account at the bank. The strife we have in hand is almost valueless in war time; nobody will buy them! The general feeling here is, better war now than a few years hence. For Russia and France are not as ready for it now as later on, and England seems to remain neutral this once. So you can imagine what excitement reigns here; thousands crowd around the latest telegrams, which are posted at every corner.

Many things turn out well after all. Our hope is centered in the Kaiser, who has peace and order in his hands, and his power to prevent a war, a war which will sweep the whole of Europe with terrible results. Austria had to punish these murdering thieves, and Germany has to defend them. The low, degraded moral state of that country, France of course wants to get her revenge, and she'll get it as hot as Germany knows how to give.

Düsseldorf, July 30.

I sent you my last via Rotterdam and hope you got it. (Not received.) I'm on the point of sending you some German papers with true accounts of the war. The German government had promised that the French would already in Belgium before the war began, and it at once sent troops into that country, took Liege by storm, a modern fortress, and we are daily awaiting great battles on the frontiers. So far, every important engagement with both the Russians and French has resulted in absolute victory for the German army, thousands of French and Russian prisoners already in this country and the feeling is one of confidence here. But how awful already the loss of life!

As America will only get news via England and France the papers I send you will be a revelation. At Liege the Germans found a lot of French officers who had gone there weeks before the war broke out; if the German troops had not at once entered Belgium we would have been fighting the French around here! The Belgian horrors against women and children (the Germans living there) are unspeakable and have proved already the cowardly behavior of the population, who killed and mutilated the German wounded, &c. If you read of brutal retaliation by the Germans, no wonder. Belgium will now be treated with terrible force.

Everybody hopes that the English fleet will try to attack the German navy in German waters. The English will get an unpleasant surprise in that case, in spite of their tremendous superiority in numbers. And Germany can't even depend on her ally Italy, which is afraid to stick to the Triple Alliance. It is simply a case of the German race against the Slav and Latin races, and England joins hands with murderers and despots, simply because German progress and industry has made her enemies. Nice ways to get rid of competition. Well, we will see who wins in the end, in spite of English fairness. And what damned liars these canting people are! For the English papers would be amused over the tales the papers in England and France invent. Every American in this country is in full sympathy with plucky, honest Germany. Your loving but terribly anxious,

Düsseldorf, August 19.

GERMANY MILITARISM WAS FORCED UPON HER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: For an American not wholly devoid of a sense of humor, even the great horror of the European situation is barely sufficient to prevent a smile at the spectacle of seven nations who (after having carefully prepared for a fight) are now indulging in a frenzied campaign to place the blame for starting said fight.

For what possible ultimate purpose has been this piling up of armament upon armament if not for war? Sooner or later such a war as is being waged was the inevitable outcome of such a situation as was created by these Powers who have been arming themselves to the teeth. The wonder is that it has not come sooner.

If anything helps explaining it is why Japan should have been suggested to the war, for she was distinctly outside the "camp." If Italy has been able to keep out of the trouble thus far, Japan's participation seems like a very unnecessary extension of a bad business, even half a dozen Kiaochows could hardly have a perceptible effect upon the European situation. Moreover, this action can hardly fail to result in a counterstroke by Germany in dragging Turkey into the fight, and thus, perhaps, involving Italy, Greece and all the Balkans.

President Wilson's plea for neutrality appears to have been honored in Germany. The breach, feeling satisfied that they have successfully placed upon Germany the onus of causing the war, of failing to conduct it humanely, in fact of being responsible for war and militarism in general, our letter writing friends now propose to scare us. Just suppose, they say, that Germany should win. There would then be no further need of us and Germany's terrible militarism.

Clearly, if Germany should be able to whip nearly all Europe, as well as Canada, to her side, and as well as Africa, there is not the slightest doubt remaining that German militarism cannot be combated by any one else's militarism. In other words, it would then be up to us to seek other means of handling these war-like Germans.

Should we not study these Germans more carefully? They seem to be a bright, jolly, studious, industrious, home loving people, of modest requirements and refined tastes—the last people on earth you would suspect of being fierce or warlike. Their Reichstag, elected from the people

at large throughout the empire, represents all shades of political opinion and includes one of the strongest Socialist factions in the world. Is it not an insult to the intelligence of a nation to suppose that they would support a Government they didn't want, a Government they have but lately adopted? Any man over fifty-five years of age should be able to recall the time when there was no German Empire, no Kaiser and no militarism of the kind we see to-day. Does not the enthusiasm with which the German people—including the most radical Socialists—support their Government in this crisis, point to the fact that they consider militarism vital to their welfare?

To this riddle there can be but one answer, namely, that militarism has been forced upon Germany as a measure of self-defense. Such is the case. No nation can possibly be more averse to the war than Germany, and she has suffered her worst horrors during four hundred years may be taken as a criterion.

Whatever the outcome, the end of this terrible war will probably afford an unusual favorable opportunity to hasten at least a partial reduction of armaments by all great nations. As the greatest neutral nation, with a reputation for fair play and disinterestedness, it might become our privilege to effect an enormous stride in the direction of universal peace, unless the witless recrimination and partisanship displayed or maintained by many of our newspapers spell out otherwise.

New York, September 3.

HARD TO FORGET GERMAN INVASION OF BELGIUM

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: From the outbreak of this present war, I have read your editorial page with interest, and I have noticed that most of the letters published by you are strongly pro-German in sympathy. This would seem to mean two things: that the management of your paper is strongly in sympathy with Germany and that the majority of your readers are of German affiliation. Whether this be true or not, I ask of you the impartial treatment that Germans insist should be accorded to all sides. I ask the publication in your column of this reply to a statement made by Dr. Ernst Richard of Columbia University and president of the German-American Peace Society.

Prof. Richard, in the *Literary Digest* for August 22, is quoted as informing our editors that "it will take a long time and strong proof of good will before Germany and Austria will forget for which side the American people stood in the war." He then goes on to say that the Western world against Muscovism and all that it implies.

To this the American people might well reply: "It will take a long time and strong proof of good faith before America will forget that Germany, the propagator of enlightened culture, disregarded the rights of Belgium and Luxembourg, exacted indemnity from outraged Belgium, ruthlessly destroyed cities and their non-combatant inhabitants as punishment for national resistance, and protection, and on exclamations of horror from the neutral spectators, laughed in the face of human opinion with this retort: 'Promissio, obligatio, signed treaty! Only a scrap of paper!'"

Does the most aggravated form of Muscovism hold any greater menace for the Western world than this shameful repudiation of Belgium's compact and these infingements of the most fundamental of the laws of civilized warfare?

All great political and social achievements have reached full attainment through a succession of progressive steps; surely the initial step leading to good universal peace is the maintenance of good faith toward neutrals and the honorable discharge of international compacts.

This is a suggestion to the President of the German-American Peace Society.

ENGLISHTOWN, N. J., Sept. 4.

TEN REPLIES TO TEN ATTACKS ON GERMANY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In your valued paper of to-day Mr. Irving Winslow of Boston rejoices out his crushing defeat of Germany. In the world's war now on, as my opinion is another than that of Mr. Winslow, I feel it my duty to give my reasons for my most sincere wish of Germany and her ally win the heroic struggle.

1. The "militarism" of Germany has been forced on her by her natural frontiers. Germany is open for every neighbor who should like to pay a military visit to Berlin. By the way, a German has less for military and naval armament than a Frenchman or an Englishman!

2. History tells us that the "rapacious" powers of Alsace and Lorraine have indeed been raped, but by the French, being good old German territory for centuries before.

3. Russia and the Herzegovina never had their "own sovereign control." These countries have been civilized by the Vienna administration with an astonishing success, the fidelity of the provinces to Austria just now being the best proof of a just and good government.

4. The "theft" of Kiaochow was a reprisal for the murder of the German Ambassador by the Chinese in Peking and China at all. The German colony in that province has spread its cultural influence in a way which has been praised many times by the Chinese Government.

5. The "civilized" nations who wish Turkey to cut Europe are Russia, the land of the Kishineff murder, and England, the land which imports Indian opium to fight her own Teuton blood, the Germans.

6. If the Allies win they will need the assistance of the whole world to keep Russia and the little good fellow, Japan, in their limits. They will have no time to care about Finland, Poland and the Jews.

7. England did not insist upon the neutrality of Luxembourg (as the White Papers show) when she negotiated with Germany on the eve of the war. England did break the peace of the Franco-German and the Orange Free State and of Tibet. How can she ever act as a power to guarantee neutrality?

8. The connection of Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark is about the same as of Alsace and France. The language in both countries is German, neither Danish nor German. The language in the latter is the same as in the former. With the same reason, as Mr. Winslow attacks Germany for that, he might as well attack the United States for having driven back the Indians or for the break with England on "that Fourth of July."

portion of former Poland has been established by the Allies who now fight Germany. Russia also controls it in her way, you know) part of Poland. Ask the people born there whether they prefer the German or Russian control.

The victory of Germany would secure peace in Europe, as that country is the only one which is able to keep the peace. The peace breakers have felt her power. Germany was at peace for forty years and has done everything to keep peace now. But Great Britain did not like Germany's increasing merchant navy. France did not like Germany's high birthrate and Russia was in a hurry to get Constantinople. And the way thither is Berlin and Vienna.

For the sake of culture I hope and trust that the land of Goethe and Richard Wagner will win!

New York. A GERMAN-AMERICAN.

VIEWSON WITH SUSPICION THE JAPANESE MOVE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: While I trust I am not in the same class with the Hon. Richmond Pearson Hobson, who for the last ten years has been a Japanese being every bush as he has wended his wayward way home in the dark, at the same time my experience in the Orient makes me view with more or less suspicion the motives of Japan in delivering her ultimatum to Germany and her subsequent declaration of war.

Every observer who has lived in the Orient knows that Japan is not only a hungry eyes the possible dismemberment of the Celestial Kingdom. There is hardly a city of any size in China which has not been the victim of Japanese never grows less. These colonists mind their own business, and while keenly disliked by the Chinese, seldom get into any serious quarrels with them.

In this crisis, however, the assurances that Japan has given to the United States that she will respect the integrity of China can hardly be believed. I believe, so much because Japan would not like to break her word, but because her treaty ally, the United Kingdom, has served notice that she will not stand for any further encroachments on the territorial integrity of the United Kingdom.

That Japan will take Tsingtau and the entire province of Shantung is a foregone conclusion. The German force when I was there amounted to but 3,500 men, which I am informed has increased to nearly 10,000. The Shantung railway is now in the hands of the Japanese. In the Philippines either in armament or location, and sooner or later it is bound to succumb to a combined attack by the Japanese and the United States.

Once in possession of the Japanese are difficult to displace and I very much doubt her assurances to the contrary. The Shantung railway is now in the hands of the Japanese. In the Philippines either in armament or location, and sooner or later it is bound to succumb to a combined attack by the Japanese and the United States.

Once in possession of the Japanese are difficult to displace and I very much doubt her assurances to the contrary. The Shantung railway is now in the hands of the Japanese. In the Philippines either in armament or location, and sooner or later it is bound to succumb to a combined attack by the Japanese and the United States.

Once in possession of the Japanese are difficult to displace and I very much doubt her assurances to the contrary. The Shantung railway is now in the hands of the Japanese. In the Philippines either in armament or location, and sooner or later it is bound to succumb to a combined attack by the Japanese and the United States.

WHY ENGLAND BLEW THE SEPOYS FROM HER GUNS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It is a strangely instructive thing to note how for generations a name of a thing can so completely obscure the thing itself in its truth and entirety vanishes out of sight. When in your paper of September 4 your correspondent, Mr. Irving Winslow, in "German View" and speaks feelingly of the blowing of Sepoys from the mouths of cannon he illustrates this fact most convincingly.

It is not English, not a drop of blood, my mother was from Dublin, though her name was Burns. My mother's mother had a young cousin who was a Lieutenant in the Sepoy army in India at the outbreak of the rebellion and was a special bunch of hellishness. He died by indescribable and loathsome torture at the hands of Sepoys. His young wife and child were killed.

It was these same Sepoys, "helpless prisoners" with hands red with the blood of women and children, who were blown from the mouths of cannon and hurled into the air for the purpose of stopping short the butchers. More death meant nothing to the Hindu fanatic who was fighting a "holy war," but the destruction of the body meant that he could not pass on in ordered progression toward perfection.

I'm half Irish, and all home ruler. But the British Government has the successful colonizing race. To its discredit are certain misunderstandings and much hardness. But in comparison with the nineteenth and twentieth century records of Germanic races in control in portions of Africa its record is white as snow. Its purpose is to rule. The purpose of German rule is to alter peoples to the Germanic pattern.

It has been strange to see that Russia should seem naturally to fit in with the two allies, natural enemies of Germany. Liberty is respected where the very word liberty is loved and honored. But yet the reason comes to one clearly when one looks straight at the situation. Liberty is loved in Russia, individual liberty has in that strange land its continuous martyrdoms. It is the Russian Government alone which is autocratic. The spirit of the people is slight with freedom.

Millarism with the Slav is and must be a temporary necessity. He instinctively hates it. So far as one can observe militarism is a national preference of the large majority of Germanic peoples.

Yet it may not be so. Remove the Hohenzollern, and perhaps that great and noble race will learn to stand without a foreigner's aid. It is a terrible thing, paper without fear of less majesty, to live under a law of things permitted, not under the law of things forbidden. It is the Hohenzollern and the Germanic race who laid back individual freedom now—who fetter the very thoughts of their people until a Pan-Germanism is their heaven. CHARLOTTE R. TANSLEY.

LITTLE ROCK, Ark., September 5.

FOLLY TO LAY THE WAR TO ONE CAUSE IN MANY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: To an American who has been in Europe and has honestly tried to understand the various points of view of the nations at war the extreme one-sidedness of the attitude in this country is terribly distressing. It is an extraordinary thing that practically all Americans in Europe took the attitude of the country in which they happened to be caught at the outset of the war. This is a very serious thing, the emotional influence exerted by the splendid devotion of the people of all countries in their hour of trial. The whole population of every country unquestionably believe themselves to be in the right, or, as they choose picturesquely to phrase it, to be in especial sympathy with Germany.

How comes it, then, that this country has so unanimously condemned the Kaiser and correspondingly lauded the

allies? That Germany could have prevented the war is unquestioned, but at a sacrifice they were unwilling to make. And the same may be equally truly said of Russia and England. I am not an unmitigated arm of the Kaiser, but a worshipper of the shrine of imperialism. But for that very reason it appears to me that Russia is an even greater danger than Germany, for German imperialism has created a sense of contentment and fair play in its people which has caused them to rise to a man in support of their Kaiser. Can the same be said of Russia or England? Of France it is unquestionably true. And have the Americans forgotten that the England which claims to stand for democracy and enlightenment is the ally of Russia, Serbia and Japan? And that this same England has recently trampled the helpless Egyptians and Boers ruthlessly under foot? And that France's actions in Morocco were no more admirable and less excusable than Germany's violation of the Belgian neutrality? And that Japan's entrance into the war was uncalculated for even an outrage to justice?

ARISTOCRATS SHOULD BEAR WAR BURDENS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Kindly allow me to give utterance to long harbored sentiments relative to the present conflict now raging in Europe. I am of the opinion that the present war was instigated by a handful of rich, powerful, miserly, self-centered individuals. The same people had it in their power to make the popular pitch of excitement to such a degree as to prevent the ignorant masses that war was inevitable. The prompt result was enlistment and immediate preparations for war.

Following this train of thought it is very evident that a huge social wrong is being committed at present in Europe. The real burden of this terrible war is being silently borne by the weak, defenceless female portion of the population. Surely those who called the war aren't shrinking from the responsibilities, cares, worries, the mental aggravation and physical impairment that are being thrust upon them. Those who caused the war ought to be compelled by their respective governments to relinquish so much of their ill got wealth as would support the wives, mothers and children of those who are jeopardizing their lives in a vain endeavor to execute the wishes and morbid desires of the aristocrat. They, the soldiers, are rushing into a veritable living hell, while the latter stands aloof, in the comfort of a warm bed, sipping totting beneath the weight of the innocent lives which he extracted from the ignorant masses—he stands there urging the soldiers to fight.

I often hear it said that it was Germany's armament and constant state of preparedness which caused the war. The war, Germany evidently was fully prepared, but why overlook the fact that France and Russia were not behind hand? Why not point to the constant rushing of the revenue into France to meet the recent increase of the term of service, to the immensely increased English navy, to her jealousy of German commerce and to her desire to break the Russian railroads toward the borders of Germany and Austria? In the name of common sense how can we single out one side as the cause and the other as merely a necessary effect when each was so evidently at once the cause and effect of the other?

It is vital that we shall rid ourselves of all emotion in judging the issue and understanding our position, for our interests also are heavily at stake. Should the war be decided in the light of the necessary effect when each was so evidently at once the cause and effect of the other?

First, that the Hague Conference be called "at once" and "never again" to discuss, presumably in the light of the efforts of the European nations now engaged in an undertaking to "disarm" each other.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

which has contained the germ for its own destruction? Why not just plain brotherhood civilization and stop there? Why any "peace parade" at this time? If a peace parade, why not a "war parade"? Let us remember that the President of the United States and the Mayor of New York have asked us to "go slow" in these perilous times.

KAISER AND HIS PEOPLE IN PERFECT HARMONY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I have just received a letter from my brother, Julius Goldschmidt, an American citizen temporarily residing in Hamburg, Germany. He is a member of the American Chamber of Commerce at Berlin and, naturally, is conversant with the present conditions.

He feels it his duty to say to the American public that the statement so frequently made in the columns of the press of this country, that there is a lack of harmony between the Kaiser and the German people, is not correct; that the whole of the German nation is entirely in its support of the Kaiser on account of their fear of an invasion of the fatherland by the French and Russians. To such an extent is the devotion of the people shown that the Kaiser is voluntarily exempt from such service.

He also deprecates the fact that the various newspapers published in England are regarding the results of the various battles as so inaccurate, and as a rule they do not do justice to the German forces. He believes that war is death, and surely the aristocracy is not pretending to shrink from death. Those who caused the war ought to be compelled by their respective governments to relinquish so much of their ill got wealth as would support the wives, mothers and children of those who are jeopardizing their lives in a vain endeavor to execute the wishes and morbid desires of the aristocrat. They, the soldiers, are rushing into a veritable living hell, while the latter stands aloof, in the comfort of a warm bed, sipping totting beneath the weight of the innocent lives which he extracted from the ignorant masses—he stands there urging the soldiers to fight.

I often hear it said that it was Germany's armament and constant state of preparedness which caused the war. The war, Germany evidently was fully prepared, but why overlook the fact that France and Russia were not behind hand? Why not point to the constant rushing of the revenue into France to meet the recent increase of the term of service, to the immensely increased English navy, to her jealousy of German commerce and to her desire to break the Russian railroads toward the borders of Germany and Austria? In the name of common sense how can we single out one side as the cause and the other as merely a necessary effect when each was so evidently at once the cause and effect of the other?

First, that the Hague Conference be called "at once" and "never again" to discuss, presumably in the light of the efforts of the European nations now engaged in an undertaking to "disarm" each other.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.

What is the use, anyway? Peace primers of the kindergarten grade all teach that the Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes. The Hague Conference, July 29, 1899, provided "a permanent Court of Arbitration" for the settlement of international disputes.